

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 13-15, 18-19, 23-26 and 28-29 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 8 and 23 are the independent claims and the rest dependent. Claims 1, 8 and 23 are currently amended and claims 4-5, 10-12, 16-17, 20-22 and 27 are cancelled.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Entry of the Amendment is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 because the Amendment: a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; b) does not present any additional claims without canceling the corresponding number of final rejected claims; and/or c) places the application in better form for an appeal, if an appeal is necessary. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 13-16, 18-19, 21, 23-26 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2002/0087359 to Bocionek in view of US Patent Publication 2002/0188896 to Filteau et al.

This rejection is moot with respect to claims 4, 11, 16 and 21 in view of the cancellation of the claims.

Acknowledging the deficiencies of Bocionek in teaching each and every limitation of claim 1, the Examiner relies on the teachings of Filteau to cure the noted deficiencies of Bocionek, alleging in the Advisory Action at page 3 that Filteau teaches a "data switching device" as recited in claim 1.

Filteau is directed to a system for generating multi-lingual reports, wherein a renderer 140 of a medical report generator 100 is configured to generate an appropriate representation of a diagnostic report 800. Additionally, the renderer 140 is configured to selectively interface with a plurality of I/O devices. *See, Filteau, FIG. 2, and paragraph [0053].*

The renderer 140 (allegedly, “a data switching device” of claim 1, as per the Examiner) is not **“configured to ascertain the type of a data object transferred via the interface, compare the ascertained type with the content of the association memory and associate a report mask with the data object on the basis of the result of the comparison,”** as recited in claim 1 and the somewhat similar features recited in claims 8 and 23. (Emphasis Added)

Filteau fails to overcome the noted deficiencies of Bocionek. Therefore, the alleged combination of Bocionek and Filteau fails to render the limitations of claims 1, 8 and 23 obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of independent claims 1, 8 and 23, as well as all claims depending therefrom, be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants hereby petition for two (2) months extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$490.00 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/AZP
AP